

Exhibit 6

A data scientist employed by Plaintiff's counsel extracted the content of web pages originating from motherjones.com and revealnews.org that are contained in the C4 set described in Plaintiff's Complaint. This exhibit contains three examples of that content for each web domain, which is entirely text. Each sample begins with the URL of the webpage followed by the webpage's entire content as it appears in C4:

Mother Jones Sample 1: <https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2008/04/even-pope-cant-shame-court-death-penalty/>

The pope came to town yesterday to speak to the nation's Catholic faithful, including some 9,000 people on the White House lawn in a crowd that included the president and 146 Catholic members of Congress. Conspicuously missing were the very prominent Catholic Supreme Court justices, who were too busy at the courthouse paving the way for states to kill a few more prison inmates, in a decision that won't be washed away by a lifetime of Hail Marys.

Today's Supreme Court not only has a conservative majority, but a Catholic one. Scalia, Thomas, Alito, Kennedy and Roberts are all relatively devout Catholics, yet while the pope was exhorting Americans to be nicer to people, every last one of them voted to continue lethal injection, regardless of how painful it might be or how much their church opposes it. These are the very same guys who we are chomping at the bit to overturn Roe v. Wade.

No word on whether the justices will meet later with the Pontiff, but we can only hope that His Excellency might remind the brethren of how little tolerance he has for "cafeteria Catholics." After all, if they're going to let faith guide their decisions, they should at least be consistent about it. The rest of American Catholics seem to be figuring that out. According to the latest polls, nearly half of all American Catholics now oppose the death penalty, up from only 20 percent in 1994. In fact, this year, U.S. bishops used Holy Week to kick off the American bishops' latest campaign to end the death penalty. Perhaps when the justices do see the Pope, it ought to be for confession.

Mother Jones Sample 2: <https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2019/03/beto-orourke-raised-a-stunning-6-1-million-in-the-first-24-hours-of-his-campaign/>

That's more than any other Democrat running for president—so far.

Beto O'Rourke raised a massive \$6.1 million in the first 24 hours of launching his presidential bid, his campaign announced Monday morning, outpacing the launch day haul of every other candidate for the Democratic nomination, including Bernie Sanders.

"In just 24 hours, Americans across this country came together to prove that it is possible to run a true grassroots campaign for president—a campaign by all of us, for all of us, that answers not to the PACs, corporations, and special interests but to the people," O'Rourke said in a statement. The stunning figure comes after some expressed skepticism at O'Rourke's decision to enter the already-crowded field of Democratic presidential hopefuls last week. O'Rourke's roll-out specifically drew criticism on social media, with some saying his video announcement hinted of sexism. Others, including Sen. Amy Klobuchar, notably eye-rolled O'Rourke's "born to run" quote from the Vanity Fair cover story that coincided his announcement.

But O'Rourke's fundraising announcement on Monday will likely dispel some of the initial cynicism.

For more on what you need to know about O'Rourke's candidacy—including how he transformed fundraising models and why it may ultimately be best not to overthink his loss to Sen. Ted Cruz—head to our story here.

Mother Jones Sample 3: <https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2013/11/john-bolton-only-option-iran-war/>

It's refreshing when a neoconservative says what he really wants. Hours after the Obama administration announced an interim agreement with Iran regarding its nuclear program, John Bolton, the hawk's hawk of the neocon crowd (remember when he practically yearned for terrorists to blow up Chicago with a nuclear device to teach Barack Obama a lesson?), was busy penning a piece for *The Weekly Standard* decrying the deal as an "abject surrender" of President Obama to the mullahs of Iran. Bolton essentially makes the familiar (and hyperbolic) conservative case that any deal that does not start with Iran trashing all of its nuclear equipment is yet another Munich moment. From this perspective, there can be no bargaining with Tehran—that is, no diplomacy. The only acceptable path is absolutist demands from the United States and its allies and total capitulation from Iran. Now what are the odds of that yielding success? Bolton is honest enough to acknowledge that talking, as he sees it, will lead to nothing but an Iran armed to the teeth with nuclear weapons. Thus, his article ends with this assertion: "in truth, an Israeli military strike is the only way to avoid Tehran's otherwise inevitable march to nuclear weapons." Thank you, Ambassador, for such candor. He is acknowledging that from his perch there is nothing Obama can do short of giving Bibi Netanyahu the green light for a military assault on Iran. Consequently, Bolton's critique of the details of the negotiations deserves little attention, for he's set on war, not diplomacy—a view that may well be reflected throughout hawkish conservative circles.

If this is not enough to discount Bolton's take on the interim accord, there's also history. Prior to the US invasion of Iraq, he declared, "We are confident that Saddam Hussein has hidden weapons of mass destruction and production facilities in Iraq," noting that the US role in Iraq after any invasion would be "fairly minimal." For years afterward—after no WMDs were found in Iraq—Bolton continued to claim the WMD case for that war was justified. Despite this lousy track record, Bolton, like other neocons, is hardly bashful when it comes to making dire statements about Iran's nuclear programs and dismissing ongoing efforts at peaceful resolution. But give him credit for being clear about his bottom-line: let's skip all the chatting and get right to war.

Reveal Sample 1: <https://revealnews.org/blog/one-year-ago-we-asked-for-border-spending-records-were-still-waiting/>

The Center for Investigative Reporting sued the Department of Homeland Security in January over records related to land purchases, fence construction and other border spending.

While President Donald Trump is visiting prototypes of a wall he wants to build along the southern U.S. border today, his administration continues to withhold records showing how much the government already has paid for border land and fence construction.

With so much taxpayer money at stake and few details about how it would be used, Reveal from The Center for Investigative Reporting wanted to know how much the government has spent to acquire land and build barriers along the border and where that land was.

We've done a lot of reporting on the wall, including publishing the most comprehensive map of where about 700 miles of fencing exists now. We even turned the border into sound so you can hear the presence and absence of barriers.

Meanwhile, the basic question of how much the government has paid remains unanswered. Nearly one year ago, reporter Andrew Becker asked U.S. Customs and Border Protection for records showing the costs of buying land and building fence along the country's 2,000-mile border with Mexico. After the government dragged its feet for months on our request, we filed a lawsuit in U.S. District Court seeking the records.

Our suit seeks records including the amount of money Customs and Border Protection and the Department of Homeland Security has paid to landowners to acquire private property for border fence construction, costs for existing fence construction, costs for land condemnation actions and locations of land parcels acquired by the government, as well as names of who received the funds. Because some border condemnation cases have lasted many years and the policy issues involve several presidencies, we asked for records dating back to 1996.

The federal Freedom of Information Act requires the government to release records in a timely manner. There are a few narrow exceptions to releasing records, and this case isn't one of them. Trump made building a wall along the border with Mexico a signature campaign promise, repeatedly vowing to make Mexico pay for it.

Officers who've worked along the border and directed policy for Customs and Border Protection have said the project isn't needed, with one calling it "an incredible waste of taxpayer money." Some estimates have put the price tag for a complete wall at more than \$70 billion.

As part of our video series called The Divided, we told the stories of activists and ranchers who are on opposite sides of the issue but are committed to humane treatment. In southern Arizona, where long stretches of desert and extreme heat have killed thousands of migrants, water is the common ground between pro-immigrant activists and a rancher who backs the wall.

Walling off even more of the border also will affect animals in the region. Right now, a mix of vehicle barriers and pedestrian fencing covers only about one-third of the nearly 2,000-mile U.S.-Mexico border.

Even with existing gaps in the fence, experts say the barriers have made it harder for animals to find food, water and mates. Many of them, such as jaguars, gray wolves and ocelots, already are endangered.

Reveal Sample 2: <https://www.revealnews.org/article/fda-warns-caffeine-powder-sellers-about-products-potential-lethality/>

One-sixteenth of a teaspoon of caffeine powder is equal to a 12-ounce cup of coffee, but a single teaspoon can lead to vomiting, anxiety and heart problems.

The Food and Drug Administration this week issued warnings to five distributors of caffeine powder, saying their products are dangerous and potentially deadly for consumers. Regulating caffeine is more or less a mess in the United States, as our video below explains.

According to the FDA, the “difference between a safe amount and a toxic dose of caffeine in these pure powdered products is very small.” Imagine using common kitchen tools to measure out a safe dose of powdered caffeine: 1/16 of a teaspoon is equal to a 12-ounce cup of coffee, but a single teaspoon can lead to vomiting, anxiety and heart problems.

A tablespoon, for that matter, will kill you.

In the FDA’s letter to one caffeine manufacturer, PureBulk Inc., the agency notes how unlikely it is that consumers would have a 1/32-teaspoon measuring tool – the serving size amount that PureBulk suggests.

Some consumer groups, such as the Center for Science in the Public Interest, say the FDA should go further and ban caffeine powder. After all, two healthy, young men died after overdosing on pure caffeine in 2014.

Currently, the substance is widely available online. In fact, when we set out to buy pure powdered caffeine for our video, it couldn’t have been an easier process. Just a few clicks and a couple of days later, pounds of the potentially lethal stuff showed up at our office door.

Banning caffeine is tricky for the FDA, however. As our video explains, caffeine is regulated differently depending on where it’s added. When it comes to energy shots and powders, caffeine is considered a dietary supplement and has been virtually unregulated. This is why, prior to Tuesday, the agency had only warned consumers of its dangers.

That soon may change. In June, the Ohio Legislature passed a bill banning the retail sales of pure powdered caffeine. Earlier this year, six U.S. senators urged the FDA to do the same.

Reveal Sample 3: <https://www.revealnews.org/blog/this-kind-of-civil-rights-lawsuit-may-be-endangered-under-trump/>

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has announced a \$2.85 million settlement in an age discrimination lawsuit against Seasons 52, part of the Darden family of restaurants. In announcing a \$2.85 million settlement in an age discrimination lawsuit today, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's acting chairwoman congratulated her civil rights agency.

"I am very proud of the relief the EEOC has obtained here ... to ensure that applicants and workers do not face this sort of discrimination in the future," Victoria Lipnic, a longtime commissioner appointed as acting chairwoman by President Donald Trump last year, said in a statement.

But Lipnic actually voted against bringing the lawsuit in the first place.

It's an example of the kind of ambitious civil rights lawsuit that may not happen once Trump's other nominees are confirmed and the five-member commission swings from a Democratic majority to a Republican one.

Back in 2015, the commission's general counsel wanted the go-ahead to sue Seasons 52, part of the Darden family of restaurants, for systematically discriminating against job applicants over the age of 40 at restaurants nationwide.

Lipnic and the other Republican commissioner voted against filing suit, while three Democrats voted for it, clearing the path that led to the nearly \$3 million settlement.

In the end, more than 135 job applicants gave testimony that Seasons 52 managers asked them their age and made comments such as, "Seasons 52 girls are younger and fresh," according to the commission. The settlement also requires the company to change its hiring processes and pay for a compliance monitor to make sure it doesn't discriminate anymore.

A Seasons 52 spokesman said in an email: "We are pleased to resolve this EEOC matter. Putting this behind us is good for Seasons 52, good for our team members and good for our shareholders." Its parent company, Darden, also owns the Olive Garden and LongHorn Steakhouse chains.

After Lipnic was appointed acting chairwoman in early 2017, a Reveal review of commission votes found that she voted against pursuing 20 lawsuits in her previous seven years as a commissioner. The other Republican commissioner serving with her voted against more than twice as many cases.

If a majority of the commission votes against bringing a lawsuit, the agency's findings of discrimination may never become public. The commission discloses its investigations only if there is a lawsuit or if an employer agrees to it as part of a prelitigation settlement, which is rare. Republicans and business groups have criticized the commission for pursuing large-scale, systemic cases, favoring a focus on reducing the commission's backlog of individual complaints. A Republican majority on the commission may lead it in that direction, but two Trump nominees still are awaiting Senate confirmation. One of them, retired Army Lt. Col. Daniel Gade, once called the idea of women in ground combat "laughable," though he said his views have changed. Trump also nominated a new general counsel, Sharon Fast Gustafson, who has signaled that she may be less aggressive in filing lawsuits and pursuing national systemic cases. If she is confirmed and steers away from cases such as the one against Seasons 52, they might not even come to the commission for a vote.